

**To:** CN=Erin Foresman/OU=R9/O=USEPA/C=US@EPA[]  
**From:** CN=Karen Schwinn/OU=R9/O=USEPA/C=US  
**Sent:** Fri 10/21/2011 3:21:20 PM  
**Subject:** Re: Review of Appendix D -- selenium

That's a good approach. May be good for all of to re-read the short piece that describes the ESA intent of this document, and then be clear on what WE need for nepa and cwa.

Erin - can you also check with CV Board (stephanie and chris, I guess) to see if they are looking at it.

~~~~~

KAREN SCHWINN  
Associate Director  
Water Division  
U.S. EPA Region 9  
75 Hawthorne Street (Wtr-1)  
San Francisco, CA 94105  
415/972-3472  
415/297-5509 (mobile)  
415/947-3537 (fax)  
~~~~~

----- Original Message -----

From: Erin Foresman  
Sent: 10/21/2011 08:16 AM PDT  
To: Carolyn Yale  
Cc: Karen Schwinn; Bruce Herbold; Tom Hagler; "Tim Vendlinski" <vendlinski.tim@epa.gov>  
Subject: Re: Review of Appendix D -- selenium

Hey Carolyn,

Thanks for these comments and other emails. I'll start consolidating comments we have so far and resend to the group. I'd like to specifically identify incorrect statements/mistakes and provide correct information. However, I don't want to do their job for them. If a section reflects a general unawareness of TMDLs through mistakes and omissions, my preference is to direct them to sources and provide them some focus by identifying the relevance to crossing the finish line for them (e.g., NEPA and obtaining CWA permits and certifications). I'll try to do that.

Regarding indirect and cumulative impacts, agreed they have not estimated these in this chapter. I'll ask about them as our comment and cite the regs taht require them. Perhaps they've estimated them elsewhere in the confusing organizational structure of this document???

\*\*\*\*\*

Erin Foresman  
Environmental Scientist & Policy Coordinator,  
US EPA Region 9 C/O Army Corps of Engineers  
650 Capitol Mall Suite 5-200, Sacramento, CA 95814  
Phone: (916) 557 5253, Fax: (916) 930 9506

<http://www.epa.gov/region9/water/watershed/sfbay-delta/index.html>

From: Carolyn Yale/R9/USEPA/US  
To: Karen Schwinn/R9/USEPA/US@EPA, Bruce Herbold/R9/USEPA/US@EPA, Erin  
Foresman/R9/USEPA/US@EPA, Tom Hagler/R9/USEPA/US@EPA, "Tim Vendlinski" <vendlinski.tim@epa.gov>  
Date: 10/20/2011 05:09 PM  
Subject: Re: Review of Appendix D -- selenium

Last comments, regarding the selenium section:

Section D5.2.1 is garbled and needs wholesale rewrite. Locations, time frame, standards... it's all confused and in places erroneous. We could cite our ANPR write-up and use the recent watershed and nps success texts to provide basic facts for a shorter profile of regulatory actions such as standards and TMDL development and implementation.

Corrections and clarifications should include:

- areas that are, and are not, in compliance with existing objectives
- the current (pre-proposal) conditions re SJ flow routing (periods when SJ water is substantially cycled south again), and potential changes in this routing with the proposal.

Information that should be added:

- the North Bay TMDL (in-progress) and information from this TMDL regarding sources and controls
- concerns regarding adequacy of existing standards, based on better understanding of physical, chemical and foodweb processes affecting species exposure
- explanation of the foodweb/ ecosystem and estuarine dynamics models that link important variables affecting selenium bioavailability, bioaccumulation and exposure. We should encourage using this conceptual framework to evaluate potential effects of actions.
- Discuss what we still need to learn about. the processes driving the variations in selenium concentrations in B-D foodwebs (e.g., inter-annual variations in clam uptake)

We should pass on an update of EPA's work toward promulgating site-specific criteria for the B-D and the species and areas of particular concern (eg sturgeon, Suisun). This raises some question about the BDCP conclusions that the anticipated levels of Se loading to Delta will not be problematic (judged by current wqs).

I would add that the analytical approach is confined to the effects of the preliminary proposal; this is more limited than a NEPA analysis. NEPA looks at cumulative and indirect actions and processes-- for good reason. Consider, for example, the possibility (of moving selenium into the Delta (as discussed in App D--a little ways, under the assumed operations) that may be mobilized as a result of expanded flood plains and occasional inundation. Under moderate hydrologic conditions, the selenium doesn't reach Suisun, where the overbite clam concentrates. App D stops at this point, assuming that this is the limit of impacts from the action (see D-40) Yet there is evidence that high flood flows (not part of the planned action) transport contaminants farther into the Delta. In other words, if this effects analysis is going to be limited to directly related impacts it will be important for the NEPA analysis to expand on indirect and cumulative effects.

C

Carolyn Yale  
US EPA Watersheds Office  
phone: 415-972-3482  
fax: 415-947-3537  
yale.carolyn@epa.gov